



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

practical matter cannot generally be satisfactorily severed for purposes of foreclosure. Nevertheless, the result of the minority doctrine is preferable in that it gives priority to the one who has added value to the property to the extent of that increment without diminishing the original interest of the doweress. This is not inconsistent with the general theory of mechanics' liens, for as to improvements dower at most attaches simultaneously with the lien. Nevertheless courts persist in an often irrational protection of the doweress.

ELECTIONS—ELIGIBILITY FOR OFFICE—MANDAMUS TO COMPEL PRINTING OF NAMES ON BALLOTS.—The Workers' League nominated for Mayor and President of the Board of Aldermen of New York City two men convicted of criminal anarchy, whose sentences were not to expire until after the term of office began. The League's committee filed certificates, valid on their face, to fill vacancies, and when the Board refused to act, an application was made to mandamus the Board of Elections to print the names on the ballots. *Held*, the Appellate Division's refusal to grant the writ of mandamus was in the exercise of a reasonable discretion. *Application of Lindgren* (1921) 232 N.Y.59, 133 N. E. 353.

Mandamus will issue in proper circumstances against election officials to compel them to act. *People v. Hartley* (1897) 170 Ill. 370, 48 N. E. 950; *People v. Dooling* (1910) 141 App. Div. 29, 127 N. Y. Supp. 748. But even though a Board of Elections has a clear ministerial duty to print names on the ballot on the filing of a certificate valid on its face, or to issue certificates of election, courts in their discretion will not compel performance of such acts, if their final effect would be a nullity. *People v. Board of Canvassers* (1891) 129 N. Y. 360, 29 N. E. 345; *Clarke v. Trenton* (1887) 49 N. J. L. 349, 8 Atl. 509. There is no provision in the New York law preventing a convict from being nominated for office. But he is ineligible to hold office while imprisoned. N. Y. Cons. Laws (1909) c. 40, § 510. The court in the instant case reached their decision on the ground that since the object of election machinery was to elect men eligible to hold office, they would not by mandamus compel a useless act. The opinion did not consider the question of the policy of a protest vote. Moreover, the applicant is asserting his own and not the nominee's civil rights, and since the Election Law contains no prohibition against the candidacy of a convict, it is questionable whether the court's main premise was warranted. It was a doubtful exercise of discretion for the Appellate Division to deny the mandamus when the concurrence of election and pardon, no matter how remote the possibility, before the term of office, would make the nomination anything but futile. The opinion did not discuss pardon.

INSURANCE—PUBLIC AS BENEFICIARY—BREACH OF CONDITION BY INSURED.—A statute required every jitney bus operator to carry indemnity insurance for the benefit of persons injured by the bus, and required the policy to provide for the payment of judgments obtained against the operator. The plaintiff sued to recover the amount of a judgment obtained against an operator thus insured by the defendant company. The operator had breached a condition in the policy. *Held*, for the plaintiff. *Bayle v. Manufacturers' Liability Ins. Co.* (N. J. 1921) 115 Atl. 383.

The beneficiary of an insurance policy cannot recover if it has become void by the insured's breach of condition. So in the case of a life insurance policy a breach of condition by the insured prevents a recovery by the beneficiary, even if her interest was vested before the breach. *Behling v. N. W. Nat. Life Ins. Co.* (1903) 117 Wis. 24, 93 N. W. 800. And where a mortgagor insures the property for the benefit of the mortgagee a breach of condition by the former defeats the right of the latter. *Merwin v. Star Fire Ins. Co.* (1876) 7 Hun 659, *aff'd* (1878) 72 N. Y. 603; see *City Five Cents Savings Bk. v. Pennsylvania Ins. Co.* (1877)